



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## THE ATHENIAN SECRETARIES.

*A Confirmation.*

In §13 of a treatise on the Athenian Secretaries, published last April as No. VII of the Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, I endeavored to show that during the two hundred years following 304/3 B. C., as in the thirty years preceding 322/1 B. C., the Prytany Secretaries followed one another in the official order of their tribes. Wherever the sequence of the tribes of a group of secretaries was known, that sequence was found to be the official order, and four cases were instanced, in which the year fixed for the archon by the official order of the secretaries' tribes coincided with the year which had to be ascribed to the archon for other reasons. At that time, these four archons were the only ones after 299/8 B. C. whose colleagues in the secretaryship we knew, and whose exact year could be determined. Now two others can be added to the list.

1) Dionysius of Halicarnassus<sup>1</sup> fixes the archon Nikostratos in the year 295/4 B. C., and his testimony is almost universally<sup>2</sup> accepted by the many scholars who in recent times have investigated the chronology of this period. According to my canon the tribe Aiantis<sup>3</sup> should have furnished the secretary for 295/4 B. C., and, through the kindness of Dr. A. Wilhelm, I am now able to state that an unpublished inscription of Nikostratos' year shows the secretary to have belonged to the deme Phaleron, of the tribe postulated. Hence it is seen that the troublous times of Lachares' tyranny did not disturb the official order.

2) A *senatus consultum*<sup>4</sup> found recently at Delphi, and to be published in an early number of the Bull. de Corr. Hell., is dated precisely, in the year 112 B. C., by the names of the Roman consuls, L. Calpurnius (Piso) and M. Livius (Drusus).<sup>5</sup> Fortunately, the translation of this document into Greek was made by

<sup>1</sup> De Dinarcho, 9.

<sup>2</sup> Schubert, R. (Hermes, X (1876), p. 447 ff.), thought that the archon for the year 301/0 B. C. was wanting in Dionysius' list, and, consequently, that Nikostratos belonged to 294/3 B. C., but Ladek, Fr. (Wiener Studien, XIII (1891), p. 117), has shown that this is impossible.

<sup>3</sup> Cornell Studies in Class. Phil. VII (1898), p. 50.

<sup>4</sup> Bull. de Corr. Hell. XXI (1897-98), p. 583 ff. and p. 600.

<sup>5</sup> Mommsen, CIL. I, p. 535.

the Athenian treasurer at Delphi, who, in order to date the decree from the Attic standpoint, added to the names of the Roman consuls that of Dionysios, the Athenian archon for the same year. On the basis of the official order, Dionysios had already been assigned by me to 112/1 B. C.<sup>1</sup>; for the secretary for Dionysios' year belonged to the tribe Aiantis,<sup>2</sup> and Aiantis was the tribe demanded for 112/1 B. C. by the official order, if it continued unbroken from 304/3 B. C. on. That it did so continue seems to me to be proved, now that we know that Dionysios was archon in 112/1 B. C.

CORNELL UNIV., ITHACA, N. Y.,  
Nov. 16, 1898.

W. S. FERGUSON.

PINDAR, NEMEAN III 62.

This is a passage that has raised abundant controversy. No one, however, so far as I am aware, has yet observed (1) that one of the scholiasts had before him a reading materially differing from any of the *textus recepti*, and (2) that the scholiast's reading, which removes all difficulty from the passage, can be restored by the alteration of a single letter.

Omitting stops (as to which editors differ), the current reading is:

“καὶ ἐγχεσφόροις ἐπιμίξαις  
Αἰθιοπέσσι χεῖρας ἐν φρασὶ πάξαιθ' ὅπως σφίσι μὴ κοίρανος ὀπίσω  
πάλιν οὔκαδ' ἀνεψιδὸς ζυμενῆς Ἑλένοιο Μέμνων μόλοι.”

Some take *χεῖρας ἐν φρασὶ πάξαιθ'* together, in a physical sense: others take *ἐν φρασὶ πάξαιθ'* in a mental sense, and associate *χεῖρας* with *ἐπιμίξαις*. Bergk emends *πάξαιθ' ὅπως* into *πάξαι θάπος*. But the concluding words of the scholium that is numbered 3 in Prof. Bury's edition run thus: “ἀντὶ τοῦ εἰς πέρας ἄγοι.” It is, I think, obvious that, instead of *χεῖρας*, this scholiast read *πεῖρας*, a Pindaric form occurring in the 2d Olympian, and equivalent to *πεῖραρ* or *πέρας*.

This rare form would, in the context, be most easily corrupted into *χεῖρας*.

I therefore have no hesitation in restoring *πεῖρας* and translating: “And that, having come hand to hand with the Ethiop spearmen,

<sup>1</sup> Cornell Studies, VII, p. 58.

<sup>2</sup> CIA. II 475.